DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 429 JC 920 090

AUTHOR Boylan, Hunter R., Ed.
TITLE Characteristics of Developmental Programs.
INSTITUTION Appalachian State Univ., Boone, NC. Reich Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 18p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Developmental Education, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC 28608.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
JOURNAL CIT Research in Developmental Education; Pilot n1, v2 n5, v5 n4 1983-1988

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Community Colleges; *Developmental Studies Programs; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Higher Education; High Risk Students; National Surveys; Postsecondary Education; Program Administration; Program Content; *Program Descriptions; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; *Remedial Instruction; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

These three serial issues focus on the characteristics and administration of developmental education programs. The following articles are featured: (1) "Characteristics of Successful Programs," which reviews research findings concerning the characteristics associated with effective and ineffective developmental programs and includes a list of exemplary programs; (2) "A Review of National Surveys of Development Education Programs," by Hunter R. Boylan, which discusses the highlights of three national surveys conducted in 1970-74, 1976, and 1984 to assess the nature and scope of developmental education programs; and reviews trends related to the provision of developmental courses, the awarding of college credit for developmental courses, and mandatory remediation; and (3) "Organizational Patterns for Developmental Education Patterns," by Hunter R. Boylan, Elaini L. Bingham, and Darlene J. Cockman, which reviews studies of the administrative location and reporting arrangements of developmental programs within the college's divisions/departments, the titles of developmental program administrators, and titles of programs. (PAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SELECTED ISSUES OF:

REVIEW OF

RESEARCH in Developmental Education

Published by Appalachian State University

ON:

Characteristics of Developmental Programs.

"Pilot Issue #2", 1983
Volume 2 Issue 5, Spring, 1983
Volume 5, Issue 4, 1988

ED341429

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. Boylan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC920090

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1983

Research in Developmental Education

"Pilot Issue #2"

A New Publication from
THE
CENTER FOR DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION
***

Featuring
***
SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS:

Recent Research Efforts

*** PAGES 1 and 2! ***

and

*** RESOURCERY ***
Your Guide to More
PAGE 3!
***

CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS

While developmental education programs have been present on college campuses in one form or another for over a century (Maxwell, 1979. p. 7), attempts to assess the effectiveness of these programs are of relatively recent vintage. The majority of initial efforts to assess the outcomes of developmental education activities resulted from the infusion of federal dollars into college programs designed to promote educational opportunity. The federal commitment to affirmative action and equal educational opportunity served as a stimulus to the rapid expansion of developmental programs during the mid-1960's (Boylan, 1982, p. 9). The requirement that programs receiving federal funds undertake some sort of evaluation activity, also served as a stimulus to research on the effectiveness of developmental programs.

This research, in turn, provided many answers to the question "What makes a successful developmental program work?" And, while these answers were varied and, at times, conflicting, the information generated by research efforts has provided a useful set of guidelines for those who wish to implement or refine developmental education programs.

RECENT RESEARCH EFFORTS

One of the first major efforts to investigate the components of successful developmental programs resulted from the FIPSE-funded "National Project II: Alternatives to the Revolving Door" -- a project involving a consortium of institutions with successful developmental programs. In his report of project school's activities, Donovan (1975) found that the more successful programs included:

* A wide variety of personal and academic development services

* An emphasis on personal counseling combined with...

* An emphasis on academic skills development

* Frequent student/staff contact.

Roueche and Snow (1977) attempted to identify "model" developmental programs using the survey technique. In the programs identified as being particularly effective, the following components were characteristically found:

* Diagnostic services

* An emphasis on learning skills development

* Personal counseling to support learning skills development

* Individualized learning opportunities provided through small classes or laboratories.

Grant and Hoeber (1978) attempted to investigate the effectiveness of developmental programs through an extensive review of the literature and research. Their findings were reported in two categories: Instructional and Programmatic. Under the heading of Instructional components of effective programs the authors found the following to be important:

* "Clearly-written, well articulated objectives made available to students"

* "Continuous and systematic planning based on feedback and program monitoring"

* "Attention to individ-

ual needs, personal styles of learning, and rates of growth"

* "Assiduous attention to appropriate 'matches' of learners, teachers, methods and materials"

* "... intensive efforts to identify how and under what learning conditions students 'transfer' knowledge.

Under the heading of Programmatic considerations, the authors found the following to be important:

* "Faculty development in specific awareness, skills, and teaching-learning strategies"

* "Refinement and/or development of diagnostic instruments"

* "...sophisticated and sensitive research designs"

* "Comprehensive curricular revisions."

Based on her experience of more than a decade of work with developmental students as well as her own review of the literature, Martha Maxwell (1979) recommended that effective learning assistance programs include:

* Diagnosis of students' strengths and weaknesses as learners

* Tutorial services

* Personal counseling

* Basic reading and study skills instruction

* English instruction

* Mathematics instruction

* Science instruction

* Built-in evaluation activities.

Keimig (1982) undertook one of the most extensive reviews of the literature currently available to develop a decision-making guide for developmental or learning improvement programs. On the basis of her research, she proposes that the two most important characteristics of successful developmental programs are:

* "...comprehensive support services with the flexibility to meet a wide variety of student needs and to personalize the academic experience"

AND

"...are integrated into the academic and social mainstream, avoiding punitive, low status overtones and the 'you cure them' mentality which are connoted by isolation within a separate remedial component."

Keimig also points out (1982, p. 11) that the least successful programs tend to be characterized by an emphasis on the remedial aspects of learning improvement. On the basis of her review of the literature, she concludes that....

"Isolated remedial courses did not make much difference in overall student success or retention, and were the least effective of all remedial efforts."

In his review of the effectiveness of developmental programs based on analysis of program reports, research, and literature, Boylan (1983) found that the programs reporting the greatest student gains...

* Provided a comprehensive array of services

* Had a high degree of student participation

* Made participation mandatory at the outset of their college careers for students considered to be "high risk"

* Offered credit for remedial and developmental courses

* Emphasized the development of students' reasoning skills in addition to basic content skills.

In addition to the research and literature arising from evaluation of developmental education programs, a wide variety of research findings from other fields are applicable to developmental education activities. Fantini and Weinstein (1968), for instance, argue that no instructor can work effectively with developmental students unless they have specific training in the techniques and methods applicable to such students. Christ and Coda-Messerle (1981) re-affirm this point and contend that faculty and staff development activities are essential to any learning assistance program.

In their analysis of college teaching methods, Dubin and Taveggia suggested that individualized instruction designed to manipulate the cognitive variables involved in learning resulted in only modest gains in student performance (1969). Manipulation of affective variables, on the other hand, seemed to result in greater gains. As a result of these initial findings, Canfield (1980) emphasized the importance of matching students' affective styles of learning with in-

Continued on p. 5

Resourcery

Exemplary Programs Featuring Comprehensive Models

The programs listed below include many of the characteristics associated with successful developmental education activities. The listing is not meant to be all-inclusive. Instead, it provides a regional sampling of exemplary developmental programs.

NORTHEAST

BASIC SKILLS PROGRAM
La Guardia Community College
31-10 Thomson Avenue
Long Island City, NY 11101
(212) 626-2700
DIRECTOR: Michael Hoban

LEARNING SKILLS CENTER
University of Pittsburgh
Student Union
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
(412) 624-5481
DIRECTOR: Georgine Materniak

MIDDLE ATLANTIC

CENTER FOR ACADEMIC REINFORCEMENT
Howard University
Washington, D.C. 20059
(202) 636-6040
DIRECTOR: Imogene Robinson

RESOURCES FOR STUDENT LEARNING
Southeastern Community College
Whiteville, NC 28472
(919) 642-7141
DIRECTOR: Thelma Barnes

MIDWEST

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM
Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI 53233
(414) 224-7700
DIRECTOR: Arnold Mitchem

DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION PROGRAM
Triton College
River Grove, IL 60171
(312) 456-0300
DIRECTOR: Sunil Chand

SOUTHERN

DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION PROGRAM
Florida Junior College - North
Jacksonville, FL 32202
(904) 358-1842
DIRECTOR: Jeffrey Stuckman

DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION PROGRAM
University of New Orleans
New Orleans, LA 70122
(504) 286-6289
DIRECTOR: David Shroyer

WESTERN

READING & STUDY SKILLS LAB
University of Texas - Austin
Austin, TX 78712
(512) 471-3434
DIRECTOR: Patricia Heard

BASIC SKILLS DIVISION
Tarrant County Junior College
Fort Worth, TX 76102
(817) 534-4861
DIRECTOR: Charles Johnson

FAR WESTERN

STUDENT LEARNING CENTER
University of California - Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720
(415) 642-6000
DIRECTOR: Kurt Lauridsen

DEVELOPMENTAL CENTER
Linn-Benton Community College
Albany, OR 97321
(503) 928-2361
DIRECTOR: Jerome Johnson

Continued from p. 6

ning Paradox, Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1969.

Fantini, M. and Weinstein, G. The Disadvantaged: Challenge to Education, New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Grant, M.K. and Hoeber, D. R. Basic Skills Programs: Are they Working, AAHE/ARIC Higher Education Research Report, No. 1, Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1978.

Keimig, R.T., "Improving Learning and Retention: The Decision Guide for Effective Programs," Unpublished manuscript, 1982.

Maxwell, M. Improving Student Learning Skills, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Roueche, J.E. and Snow, J. G. Overcoming Learning Problems, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Whimbey, A. Intelligence Can be Taught, New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1975.

RESEARCH IN DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION

Our new publication is published five times each academic year to review current research in areas relating to the practice of developmental education. Each issue will be devoted to a particular subject of interest to developmental educators, and each will include a review of important research, a summary of findings, a list of resources, and more.

TO SUBSCRIBE--

Fill in the coupon below, and send it with $9.50 to:

Managing Editor
Research in Developmental Education
Center for Developmental Education
Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608

NAME

TITLE

INSTITUTION

CITY STATE ZIP

structional treatments in order to produce more effective learning. Additional research using the Canfield Learning Styles Inventory (1976) appears to confirm Grant and Hoeber's (1978) contention that matches of learning styles to instructional activities are an important component of successful programs.

Cross, in her 1976 review of the literature on individualized instruction, found that successful individualization requires: 1) student involvement in the learning process, 2) clear instructional goals and objectives, 3) small units of learning, 4) frequent evaluation through testing, and 5) self-pacing options for students. The research of Cross supports the contention of Roueche and Snow (1977) that individualized, self-paced programs for learning are important to the success of developmental students. It also supports Grant and Hoeber's findings (1978) regarding the importance of clearly articulated goals and objectives in effective developmental instruction activities.

Maxwell's review of the literature on psychological characteristics of developmental students (1979) suggests that many developmental learners have negative attitudes toward education as well as poor study and learning skills. This evidence reinforces the notion expressed by several researchers that successful developmental programs are comprehensive in nature and provide personal counseling as well as learning skills development activities.

Whimbey's work on the development of human intelligence suggests that much of what is commonly called "intelligence" represents a a series of reasoning and critical thinking skills (1975). Whimbey's research also suggests that these skills can be taught to any learner and that training in such skills can lead to a substantial improvement in students' capacities to perform well academically. These findings tend to support Boylan's (1983) emphasis on critical thinking and reasoning skills training as an important component of successful developmental programs.

SUMMARY OF SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Given the available research from developmental education and related fields, it is possible to identify a number of characteristics that seem to be associated with more successful programs. While the exact interaction between these characteristics and successful outcomes is unknown, it appears that programs possessing these characteristics are more likely to be successful than those which do not.

Just as learning activities consist of both content and process variables, the characteristics of successful developmental programs also seem to include both content and process variables. By combining overlapping and related variables as identified in the literature, the characteristics may be summarized as follows:

CONTENT

* Services designed to diagnose student needs at the outset of their participation in the program

* Services designed to improve student mastery in the basic skill areas of reading, writing, and mathematics

* Services designed to promote students' personal development and academic adjustment

* Services designed to promote the development of students' reasoning and critical thinking skills

* On-going program evaluation activities

PROCESS

* An individualized approach with an emphasis on students' academic and personal development

* A focus on the improvement of learning as opposed to the remediation of deficiencies

* A structured set of procedures with an emphasis on goals and objectives

* Frequent student/faculty contact

* Systematic planning, monitoring, and revision of program activities.

The increasing amount of research in developmental education has made it apparent that improving student learning skills is a unified process rather than a set of individual activities. Those programs which include isolated and unrelated services are far less likely to be successful than those which are comprehensive and systematic. Furthermore, those programs

which emphasize personalization of the learning process and attend to the affective as well as the cognitive dimensions of learning are also more likely to be successful.

While developmental programs vary greatly in terms of their resources, the size of their staff, and the nature of their clients practically all programs -- large and small -- can implement their services utilizing appropriate processes. While the range of program services may be restrained by resource availability, there is no reason why all developmental services cannot combine attention to the affective dimensions of learning with attention to the cognitive dimensions. In short, program success in developmental education need not be related to program size or program resources. The characteristics which seem to make the most difference are those that all programs may adopt in order to increase the likelihood that their services will, indeed, improve the quality of student learning.

REFERENCES

Boylan, H.R. "The Growth of the Learning Assistance Movement," in Hunter Boylan (Ed.), Forging New Partnerships in Learning Assistance, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Boylan, H.R. Is Developmental Education Working?: An Analysis of the Literature, NARDSPE Research Report # 2, Chicago: NARDSPE, 1983.

Canfield, A.A. Learning Styles Inventory, Rochester, MI: Humanics Media, 1976.

Canfield, A.A. Learning Styles Inventory Manual, Rochester, MI: Humanics Media, 1980.

Christ, F.L. and Coda-Messerle, M. (Eds.), Staff Development for Learning Support Systems San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Cross, K.P. Accent on Learning, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Donovan, R.A. National Project II: Alternatives to the Revolving Door, New York: Bronx Community College, 1975.

Dubin, R. and Taveggia, T. C. The Teaching/Lear-

Continued on p. 4

Research in Developmental Education is published five times per academic year.
Editor: Hunter R. Boylan
Managing Editor: Doree N. Pitkin
Consulting Editor: Milton "Bunk" Spann

Manuscripts, news items, and abstracts are accepted by the Editor, RIDE, Center for Developmental Education, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC 28608.

Subscriptions are $9.50 per year. North Carolina residents add 38 cents sales tax; subscribers in foreign countries and $1.50/year shipping and pay by bank draft. Send subscriptions to Managing Editor, RIDE at the same address or call (704)262-3057.

© 1983

Bulk Rate
U.S. Postage
Paid
Boone, NC
PERMIT #21

Center for Developmental Education
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28608

Published by Appalachian State University Volume 2, Issue 5

Research In Developmental Education

Hunter R. Boylan, Editor

A Review of National Surveys of

Developmental Education Programs

By Hunter R. Boylan

As developmental programs proliferated on college campuses during the late 1960's and early 1970's, several researchers conducted national surveys to assess the nature and scope of developmental education activities in postsecondary education. Most of these surveys were designed to find out how many campuses offered developmental services, what sort of services were offered, and how many students participated in these services. While each survey differed somewhat in design, focus, and sample population, several of them explored similar issues. Since the surveys took place over a period running from 1970 to 1985, they provide a basis for assessing growth and changes that have taken place in the field of developmental education during the past fifteen years.

This issue of RESEARCH in DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCTION provides a selected review of these surveys. The three survey's selected for review here include those of Pat Cross (1976), John Roueche and Jerry Snow (1979), and Douglas Wright (1985).

The Surveys

The Rouche and Snow survey included 300 colleges and universities selected at random from the the 1974-75 EDUCATION DIRECTORY, COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES published by the National Center for Educational Statistics. Of the institutions surveyed, 139 two-year and 134 four-year colleges and universities responded. This represented a 93% return for two-year institutions and an 89% return for four-year institutions. The survey was conducted during the 1975-76 academic year and published in OVERCOMING LEARNING PROBLEMS — originally published in 1977.

Cross's results actually involve two surveys -- one conducted in 1970 and one in 1974. Both studies included a 20% random sample of two-year institutions listed in the 1973 COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGE DIRECTORY published by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Responses were received from 184 two-year institutions representing an 84% return rate. The results from these studies were published in ACCENT ON LEARNING — originally published in 1976.

Wright's survey included 511 colleges and universities selected from a pool of 3,238 listed in the data banks of the National Center for Educational Statistics. This sample was stratified by enrollment size and state versus private control and then sorted by type and region. Of the institutions surveyed, 96% provided responses for the study. The results of the survey were presented at the 1985 American Educational Research Association Convention in a paper entitled "Remedial/Developmental Studies in Institutions of Higher Education, Policies and Practices, 1984 (Wright, 1985).

The Findings

Each of the surveys reviewed here explored a wide variety of issues and policies in developmental education. In three areas, however, the surveys provide similar data. These areas include: 1) the percentage of institutions offering remedial or developmental courses, 2) the percent offering degree credit for these courses, and 3) whether participation in these courses was mandatory or voluntary. The discussion of each survey presented here is organized according to these categories.

The Cross Survey, 1970-1974

Cross (1976) found that the number of two-year institutions providing developmental courses increased from 92% to 98% between 1970 and 1974. Increases were also found in recruitment efforts, special counseling, and advising programs. A tendency was also discovered for programs to become more comprehensive between 1970 and 1974. Of those surveyed in 1970, 20% of the programs featured comprehensive services including recruitment, courses, and special counseling and advising. This figure had increased to 36% by 1974.

Among those institutions offering developmental courses, 32% offered degree credit for these courses in 1970 while 53% offered such credit by 1974. In 1970, 25% offered no credit for developmental courses. By 1974, however, this figure had declined to 20%.

While the percentage of two-year institutions offering developmental courses increased from 1970 to 1974, the percentage of institutions requiring these courses for underprepared students declined. Of those institutions surveyed, 79% made such courses mandatory for underprepared students in 1970 while only 59% made them mandatory by 1974.

The Rouche and Snow Survey, 1976

Rouche and Snow (1977) found that 93% of the two-year institutions and 78% of the four-year institutions surveyed offered developmental courses in 1976. This finding is consistent with Cross's results for two-year institutions.

The Roueche and Snow study also suggested that many institutions had developed comprehensive programs in addition to individual courses to serve underprepared students. Among those surveyed, 80% of the two-year institutions provided learning assistance centers as did 61% of the four-year institutions.

Among two-year institutions, 58% offered degree credit for developmental courses in 1976. Among four-year institutions, only 38% of those reporting offered degree credit for developmental education courses. Insofar as the figures from two-year institutions are concerned, these findings are also consistent with those of Cross.

Data from the Roueche and Snow survey suggest a continued decline in the percentage of institutions requiring underprepared students to take developmental courses. Their report indicated that only 29% of the two-year institutions surveyed made participation in developmental courses mandatory for underprepared students by 1976. There is a substantial difference between this figure and the 59% of two-year institutions reporting that developmental courses were required for underprepared students in 1974.

Among four-year institutions surveyed, 25% reported that developmental courses were mandatory for underprepared students. Since the Cross survey included only two-year institutions, no comparative data is available for this group.

The Wright Survey, 1984

Wright (1985) reported that 88% of the two-year and 78% of the four-year institutions responding to his survey offered developmental courses. He also found that 94% of the two-year and 86% of the four-year institutions surveyed also offered comprehensive support services such as learning assistance centers. These figures appear to be consistent with those reported by Cross (1976) and Roueche and Snow (1977) although Wright's figure for the percentage of two-year colleges offering developmental courses in 1984 is slightly lower.

Wright's survey explored the issue of credit for developmental courses by sub-

ject area. He found that 24% of two-year institutions and 34% of four-year institutions offered regular degree credit for developmental reading courses. 26% of the two-year institutions and 35% of the four-year institutions surveyed offered regular degree credit for developmental writing. In the area of mathematics, 24% of the two-year institutions and 35% of the four-year institutions offered regular degree credit for developmental courses.

Wright also studied the issue of whether developmental courses are mandatory or voluntary for underprepared students according to subject. He found that developmental reading was required for underprepared students by 45% of the two-year institutions and 59% of the four-year institutions. Developmental writing was required by 54% of the two-year institutions and 73% of the four-year institutions surveyed. Developmental mathematics was required by 52% of the two-year institutions surveyed and by 67% of the four-year institutions.These percentages differ substantially from those reported by Roueche and Snow (1977) but are consistent with those reported for two-year institutions by Cross (1976).

Trends in Survey Findings

Institutions Offering Developmental Courses

During the period of 1970 to 1984, the percentage of institutions offering developmental courses remained relatively constant. Nevertheless, there are some minor differences between the three studies. Cross (1976), for instance, reported that 98% of the two-year colleges surveyed offered developmental courses in 1974 while Roueche and Snow (1977) reported 93% in 1976 and Wright (1985) reported 88% in 1984. These figures probably reflect sampling and methodological differences in the studies rather than a trend in the number of institutions offering developmental courses.

Since Cross's study provided no data from four-year institutions, no comparison in the percentage of senior institutions offering developmental courses can be made for the period of 1970 to 1976. Between 1976 and 1984, however, the percentage remained constant at 78%.

Apparently, there has been little or no decline in the last fifteen years in the percentage of institutions which offer developmental courses. This percentage has remained more or less constant in spite of a decline in federal support for special programs for disadvantaged students and in spite of legislative efforts in many states to reduce support for developmental education. This appears to be true in both two-year and four-year institutions.

Institutions Offering Developmental Courses for Degree Credit

The figures regarding the percentage of institutions offering developmental courses for regular degree credit reflect a downward trend between 1976 and 1984for two-year institutions. In the Roueche and Snow survey (1977), 58% of the two-year institutions surveyed offered regular degree credit for developmental courses as of the 1976 academic year. By 1984, according to Wright's data (1985), that figure declined to approximately 25%.

It is possible that the difference in the percentage of institutions reporting that regular degree credit is granted for developmental courses may be partially due to differences in survey methodology or the way in which questions were phrased in the two surveys. These differences, however, are unlikely to account for a discrepency of thirty-three percentage points between the two surveys. It must be assumed, therefore, that two-year institutions are currently granting regular degree credit for developmental courses with less frequency than they did in the mid-1970's.

This does not mean that two-year institutions are offering no credit at all for developmental courses. A more likely explanation is that these institutions have increasingly elected to award "institutional" credit for developmental courses instead of degree credit. The awarding of institutional credit is a relatively recent trend in two-year institutions. Since federal regulations require students to be enrolled in credit courses in order to receive financial aid, two-year institutions could not afford to offer very many non-credit courses. An alternative was to offer courses which carried credit

TABLE I - Comparison of Survey Results

1. Percent of responding institutions offering developmental courses.

	1970	1974	1976	1984
Two-year	92	98	93	88
Four-Year	--	--	78	78

2. Percent of responding institutions offering developmental courses for regular degree credit.

	1970	1974	1976	1984
Two-year	32	53	58	25*
Four-Year	--	--	38	35*

3. Percent of responding institutions requiring developmental courses for underprepared students.

	1970	1974	1976	1984
Two-year	79	59	29	50*
Four-year	--	--	25	67*

* Percentages marked by asterisk indicate the aggregate mean for reading, mathematics, and English courses.

towards a full-time load but which could not be transferred to other institutions nor counted towards a degree. This enabled two-year institutions to collect credit fees without having to offer credit for courses that were not considered "college level."

In the case of four-year institutions the percentage offering regular degree credit for developmental courses has remained relatively constant. Roueche and Snow (1977) reported that 38% of four-year institutions offered such credit for developmental courses in 1976 while Wright reported that approximately 35% of these institutions offered regular degree credit for developmental courses in 1984.

Institutions Requiring Developmental Courses for Underprepared Students

In the early to mid-1970's a trend away from requiring underprepared students to take developmental courses was noted. According to Cross's data (1976), 79% of

two-year institutions required underprepared students to take developmental courses in 1970 while only 59% had this requirement in 1974. Roueche and Snow's survey (1977), indicated that this figure had declined to 29% by 1976.

In recent years, however, this trend appears to have been reversed. Wright (1985) reported that about 50% of the two-year institutions surveyed required underprepared students to take developmental courses by 1984. This represents a 20% increase from 1976.

A similar trend is also apparent for four-year institutions. Roueche and Snow (1977) reported that only 25% of four-year institutions required underprepared students to take developmental courses in 1976. Wright (1985), however, found that approximately 67% of four-year institutions required developmental courses for underprepared students by 1984.

While some of these differences may be due to differences in the sample and methodology of the two surveys, it is unlikely that such differences alone would account for the disparity between the 1976 and the 1984 figures. A definite trend toward requiring developmental courses for certain students appears to exist among contemporary postsecondary institutions.

One explanation for this may be that the recent emphasis on excellence in postsecondary education has caused institutions to mandate participation in developmental courses as a way of improving student performance. Another possibility is that institutions have mandated participation in developmental courses for certain students in the hopes of increasing retention.

It is worth noting that between 1976 and 1984, a substantial decline in the college-age population took place (see RiDE, Number 2, 1984 for a further discussion of this phenomenon). In many instances, this resulted in shortfalls in new student admissions. In an effort to counteract these enrollment shortfalls, many institutions placed greater emphasis on the retention of currently enrolled students. Since participation in developmental education programs is correlated with improved retention (Boylan, 1985), it is likely that many institutional administrators viewed mandatory participation in developmental programs as a way of improving institutional retention. As a result, the previous trend towards voluntary participation in developmental courses was reversed between 1976 and 1984.

Conclusions

For those involved in the profession and practice of developmental education, it should be comforting to note that there has been no actual decline in the percentage of postsecondary institutions offering developmental courses during the past fifteen years. The percentage has remained relatively constant in spite of efforts by many campus administrators, federal officials, and state legislators to eliminate funding for developmental programs. It is quite possible, however, that the resources of individual programs and the number of students they can serve have been reduced over the years.

The trend away from granting regular degree credit for developmental courses is a disturbing one. Wright's data (1985) suggests that four-year institutions are more likely to offer credit for developmental courses than two-year institutions. This is in spite of the fact that developmental courses are often among the more rigorous courses offered in community colleges (Richardson, 1983). The trend on the part of two-year institutions to offer developmental courses for institutional credit instead of regular credit appears, at best, to be a purely cosmetic response to the serious problems of underpreparedness. At worst, it represents a somewhat cynical attempt to retain revenues while hiding the problem of underpreparedness and penalizing those students that two-year institutions were originally designed to serve.

The trend towards requiring developmental courses for underprepared students is a reasonable one. While improved diagnosis is likely to result in larger numbers of students being placed in required developmental courses, this trend will have a positive impact in the long run. If the developmental courses into which underprepared students are placed actually

improve student learning skills, their mandatory placement should enable institutions to maintain academic standards and still improve student retention.

References

Boylan, H.R., "The Effectiveness of Developmental Education Programs," RESEARCH in DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION, Volume 2, Number 2, 1985.

Cross, K. P., ACCENT ON LEARNING, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Richardson, R.C., Fisk, E.C., and Okun, M. A., Literacy in the Open-Access College., San Franciso: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Roueche, J.E. and Snow, J.G., OVERCOMING LEARNING PROBLEMS, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

****

RESEARCH IN DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION is published five times per academic year by the Center for Developmental Education, Appalachian State University. To subscribe, send your name and mailing address, along with your check or purchase order (prepaid orders only, please) for $9.50 for a one-year subscription to:

MANAGING EDITOR
RESEARCH IN DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION
CENTER FOR DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION
APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
BOONE, NC 28608

****

U.S. Postage
Permit No. 36
PAID
Non-Profit Org.
Boone, N.C.

Center for Developmental Education
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28608

Research in Developmental Education is published five times per academic year.
Editor: Hunter R. Boylan
Managing Editor: Doree N. Pitkin
Consulting Editor: Milton "Bunk" Spann

Manuscripts, news items, and abstracts are accepted by the Editor, RiDE, Center for Developmental Education, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC 28608

Subscriptions are $9.50 per year. North Carolina residents add 38 cents sales tax; subscribers in foreign countries add $1.50/year shipping and pay by bank draft. Send subscriptions to Managing Editor, RiDE, at the same address or call (704) 262-3057.

REVIEW OF
RESEARCH
in Developmental Education
Hunter R. Boylan, Editor
Published by Appalachian State University
Volume 5, Issue 4, 1988

Organizational Patterns For Developmental Education Programs

By Hunter R. Boylan, Elaini L. Bingham,
and Darlene J. Cockman

While there are over 2,500 developmental education programs in colleges and universities across the United States, there is little information available regarding where these programs fit into the administrative structure of their institutions, what they are called, and how they report. Observation suggests that developmental programs are housed either in student affairs or academic affairs divisions but there are exceptions. Sometimes they report to a non-academic officer and, on occasion, they even report to the institution's president. Furthermore, there is little evidence to suggest that a standard nomenclature exists for developmental programs. Even though their functions are similar, developmental programs on different campuses have a variety of different titles. Because of this, the National Center for Developmental Education receives inquiries almost every week regarding the placement of developmental programs in the organizational structures of institutions. Inquiries are also received regarding the names of programs, the titles of those who direct them, and their reporting lines within the administrative structure.

This issue of *RRiDE* is, therefore, devoted to the exploration of organizational and administrative arrangements for developmental programs. It will attempt to answer some of the most frequently asked questions about these arrangements by reviewing data from the Center's national study of exemplary programs.

The exemplary programs study was conducted during 1985 and 1986 in an attempt to investigate characteristics common to state-of-the-art developmental programs and to identify some of these programs. Data for the study were obtained by requesting that developmental educators from each state identify and provide information on the developmental programs in their states. Once programs in each state were identified, follow-up questionnaires were sent to those individuals in charge of these programs to gather additional data. Program directors were also asked to provide evaluation reports and sample materials from their programs.

These materials were then reviewed by a panel of experts to determine which programs appeared to exemplify the state-of-the-art in developmental education. While the resulting document, *The National Directory of Exemplary Programs in Developmental Education* (Spann & Thompson, 1986), is available as a separate publication, the raw data from the study were used to prepare this issue of *RRiDE*.

As might be expected, the quality and quantity of information provided in the exemplary programs project varied widely from state to state. Furthermore, many of the programs identified were either unwilling or unable to reply to the follow-up questionnaire or provide additional data about their activities. Although 40 states and the District of Columbia were represented in the study, the resulting data represent neither a random sample nor an all-inclusive national study. The reports from the Exemplary Programs Directory reviewed in our present study include only those considered to be most representative of the state-of-the-art in developmental education—a total of 149 programs. Of these, 142 provided enough information to answer the questions addressed in this study. Of these 142 programs, 64 were located on public, two-year campuses and four on private, two-year campuses. Forty-five were located on public, four-year campuses and 29 on private, four-year campuses.

While the available data have limitations and the results may not be generalizable, they represent a pool of information that can be used to identify general trends in the organization and administration of developmental programs. These general trends are reported in the following pages.

DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS AND THE INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE

The first area to be reviewed was the administrative location of developmental programs. From a review of the data, it appears that most developmental education programs are part of the academic affairs structure of their institutions. This is shown in TABLE I.

TABLE I

Administrative Location for Developmental Education Programs

Institutional Administrative Unit	Number	%
Academic or Instructional Affairs	112	79
Student Affairs/ Student Development	17	12
Other Administrative Unit	13	9
	142	100

*All percentages are rounded off to nearest .01

Of those programs reviewed, 112 or 79% were housed within the academic affairs area. Only 17 or 12% of the programs were housed in student affairs. An additional 13 programs (9%) were housed in some other area or had some other reporting line. Of these 13, nine reported directly to the president of their institution.

REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS FOR DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS

Developmental programs are not only housed most often in the academic affairs area, they also tend to report most frequently to the chief academic affairs officer. This is shown in TABLE II.

TABLE II

Reporting Arrangements for Developmental Programs

Title of Administrator to which Programs Report	Number	%
Dean of Instruction or Academic Vice President	86	61
Assistant Academic Dean or Assistant Vice President	8	5
Dean of a College	14	10
Assistant or Associate Dean of a College	4	3
Dean of Students or Vice President for Student Affairs	15	11
Assistant/Associate Dean or Vice President for Student Affairs	2	1
Other Administrator	13	9
	142	100

*All percentages are rounded of to nearest .01

Eighty-six, or 61%, of the programs reviewed reported directly to the Dean of Instruction or the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Of those programs housed in a particular college (most often the College of Education, the College of General Studies, or the College of Arts and Science), the vast majority reported directly to the dean of that college. Of 18 combined programs housed in colleges, 14 (78%) reported directly to the dean. Only four (12%) reported to an associate or an assistant dean.

Similarly, the majority of programs housed in the student affairs area reported directly to the chief student affairs officer. Of the 17 combined programs reporting in the student affairs area, 15, or 88%, reported directly to the Dean of Students or the Vice President for Student Affairs. Only two (12%) reported to an associate or an assistant dean or vice president. As noted earlier, of those reporting outside of either academic affairs or student affairs, nine reported directly to the president.

TITLES OF DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS

The most common title for the administrator of a developmental program was "director." As TABLE III shows, 70, or 49%, of those programs reviewed were headed by a director.

TABLE III

Titles of Developmental Program Administrators

Administrator Title	Number	%
Director	70	49
Coordinator	26	18
Department Chair or Head	19	13
Dean	7	5
Assistant Vice President or Assistant Vice Chancellor	4	3
Assistant or Associate Professor	5	4
Associate Dean	3	2
Assistant Dean	3	2
Learning Assistance or Developmental Education Specialist	2	2
Other	3	2
	142	100

*All percentages rounded off to nearest .01

The next most common title for program administrators was "coordinator." Twenty-six (18%) of those heading developmental programs held this title.

Sixty-seven percent of the programs reviewed, therefore,

were headed by either a director or a coordinator. This appears consistent with the fact that most developmental programs report directly to the chief academic officer since the title of director or coordinator is generally on a reporting line to the chief administrator of a given area.

Nineteen (13%) of the developmental programs were organized as academic departments with a department chairman or head. Seven (5%) were headed by a dean. This is also consistent with the data showing that those developmental programs housed in colleges usually report to the dean of that college. Other titles for developmental program administrators included Assistant Vice President or Assistant Vice Chancellor (4) or associate or assistant dean (6).

TITLES FOR DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS

As shown in TABLE IV, the most common title for the programs reviewed was "Developmental Education Program" or "Department of Developmental Education." Fifty-seven, or 40%, of the programs had this title.

TABLE IV

Titles of Developmental Programs

Program Title	Number	%
Developmental Education Program or Department of Developmental Education	57	40
Learning Center or Learning Assistance Program	30	21
Special Services Program	13	9
Academic Development Program	10	7
Reading and/or Study Skills Program	8	6
University/College Skills Program	6	4
Academic Skills or Academic Foundations Program	4	3
General Studies Program	4	3
Other	10	7
	142	100

*All percentages rounded off to nearest .01

The second most common title was "Learning Center" or "Learning Assistance Program." Thirty, or 21% of the total, had this title. Other frequently encountered titles included Special Services Program (13 or 9%), Academic Development Program (10 or 7%), Reading and/or Study Skills Program (8 or 6%) or University/College Skills Program (6 or 4%). Other titles cited with some regularity include Academic Skills or Academic Foundations Programs (4 or 3%) and General Studies Programs (4 or 3% of the total). Titles tabulated under "other" which also appeared in the study included Educational Opportunity Program, Guided Studies Program, Intermediate Studies Program, Adult Education Program, Communications Skills Laboratory, Instructional Resources Program, "PLUS Center," "ACCESS Division," Academic Reinforcement Center, and Lower Division Studies Program.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

One of the strongest trends identified in this study was that developmental education programs are most often housed in the academic affairs area of their institutions. This should not be surprising since developmental programs are concerned with the academic development of students and most of these programs offer course work of some kind. Furthermore, many experts (Roueche & Snow, 1977 and Keimig, 1983) suggest that developmental programs operate more effectively when they are part of the overall academic framework of the institution. Whatever the reasons, a clear-cut trend exists for developmental programs to be part of the academic affairs structure.

Another strong trend was for developmental programs to report directly to the chief officer of their particular area. When programs were housed in the academic affairs area, they most frequently reported either to the dean of a college or to the chief academic affairs officer. Similarly, programs housed in student affairs usually reported directly to the chief student affairs officer.

The fact that developmental programs most frequently report to the chief administrator in their area is an important one to note. It suggests that such programs have direct access to institutional decision makers. It further suggests that these programs were considered important enough by campus administrators to be placed at a level equivalent to that of an academic department or higher. In essence, the state-of-the-art developmental programs reviewed here are on a par with most other sub-units in the administrative hierarchy of their institutions.

This observation is further supported by the titles assigned to those who administer developmental programs. Fully 80% of the programs reviewed were headed by an individual with the title of director, coordinator, or department head. An additional 12% were headed by individuals with titles such as assistant vice president, assistant vice chancellor, or assistant provost. This suggests that they are not only full-time professionals but also have some advanced graduate training to qualify them for administrative positions at that level.

It was somewhat surprising to discover as much consistency as there was insofar as the titles of programs are concerned. Sixty-one percent of the programs reviewed were either titled "developmental education program" or "learning assistance program."

This is surprising because developmental programs have a variety of origins. Some were started as a result of federal grant programs. Some were begun with local funds as a

response to the needs of open admission students. Others were an outgrowth of reading and study skills programs or services provided by counseling centers. Yet the majority of the programs reviewed had similar titles. This may reflect that the terms "developmental education" and "learning assistance" are becoming more widely understood and accepted in academe. Both terms were coined in the late 1960's and have been around long enough to become part of the vocabulary of postsecondary education.

As noted earlier in this report, the data reviewed here are from developmental programs that were judged to represent the state-of-the-art in the field. The trends identified here may be more characteristic of more mature, highly developed programs than of newer or less well-developed programs. Furthermore, documentation provided by those programs participating in the study suggests that they are among the more effective developmental programs in the country. The trends discussed here may be related in some way to the success of these programs. It is difficult to tell, however, whether the trends are a cause of the programs' success or a result of that success. It can only be said that programs judged to be effective and representative of state-of-the-art in developmental education tended to have the sort of administrative and organizational arrangements discussed here. It will remain for further research to ascertain the extent to which these arrangements are a contributing factor to that success.

REFERENCES

Kiemig, R. (1983). *Raising Academic Standards: A Guide to Learning Improvement*, (AAHE/ERIC Research Report #4). Washington: AAHE.

Roueche, J. & Snow, J. (1977). *Overcoming Learning Problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spann, M. & Thompson, C. (1986). *The National Directory of Exemplary Programs in Developmental Education*. St. Petersburg, FL: H & H Publishing Company.

U.S. Postage
Permit No. 36
PAID
Non-Profit Org.
Boone, N.C.

National Center for Developmental Education
Reich College of Education
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28608

Review of Research in Developmental Education is published five times per academic year.
Editor: Hunter R. Boylan
Managing Editor: Barbara Calderwood
Consulting Editor: Milton "Bunk" Spann

Manuscripts, news items, and abstracts are accepted by the Editor, RRIDE, National Center for Developmental Education, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC 28608

Subscriptions are $9.50 per year. North Carolina residents add 38 cents sales tax; subscribers in foreign countries add $1.50/year shipping and pay by bank draft. Send subscription to Managing Editor, RRIDE, at the same address or call (704)262-3057/4101

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges MAR 13 1992